IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 16831 of 2004

Between:

1 Tourism Development Corporation Officers' Association Registration No.170/03,1-2-339/1, Street No.6, Domalguda Hyderabad rep. by its President, Mr. V.V.S. Ganga Raju,
S/o. Koteswara Rao, Aged 44 years.
2 President, Mr. V.V.S. Ganga Raju S/o. Koteswara Rao
C/o. 1st Petitioner.
3 T.V. Sudharsan Rao S/o. P.V. Srinivasa Rao, R/o. Tirupathi
4 Nageswara Rao S/o. Venkateshwarlu, Tirupathi.
5 Purender S/o. Narasimha Rao, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 A.P. Tourism Development Corporation Ltd., Tourism House " 3-5-891, Himayathnagar, Hyderabad-500 029, rep. by its Managing Director.
2 A.P. Tourism Development Corporation Ltd., Tourism House " 3-5-891, Himayathnagar, Hyderabad-500 029, rep. by its General Manager (Administration).

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an order, direction or writ particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ declaring the proceedings RC.No.TDC/Admn/2004 Dt. 11.9.2004 in so far as petitioners are concerned is discriminatory and vindictive and set aside the same.

Counsel for the Petitioner:SMT.K.UDAYA SRI

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.N.KRISHNA RAO

The Court at the admission stage made the following :

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 16831 of 2004

ORDER:

The petitioners are working under the respondent-corporation. They approached this Court through this writ petition challenging the transfer order dated 11.9.2004. They are questioning the said order on two grounds viz., that they are being victimized as office bearers, and they are transferred to various places without prior consent, though the consent of the contract employees was taken into consideration before effecting transfers.

The petitioners did not question the competency of the transferring authority. As the orders were passed on administrative grounds, the petitioners, who are liable for transfer, cannot question the proceedings on the mere ground that they were not consulted. The petitioners cannot maintain the writ petition against the impugned order.

The learned Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners made a representation to the 1st respondent for retention at the respective places and it is pending with the 1st respondent.

In view of the above submission made by the learned Counsel for the petitioners, the 1st respondent is directed to pass appropriate orders on the representation made by the petitioners at the earliest.

With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

_____

21st September, 2004

Nn.

Copies to:

1. The Managing Director, A.P. Tourism Development Corporation Ltd., Tourism House " 3-5-891, Himayathnagar, Hyderabad-500 029.
2 The General Manager (Administration), A.P. Tourism Development Corporation Ltd., Tourism House " 3-5-891, Himayathnagar, Hyderabad-500 029.
3. Two C.D. copies.